

U.S. Application No. 10/621,995 – Filed: July 17, 2003
Amendment Dated: March 25, 2004
Reply to Office Action Dated: January 13, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated January 13, 2004, the Examiner has objected to Claims 1 and 3 due to certain informalities, and has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Steiner, et al. Further, the Examiner has kindly indicated that Claims 2 and 3 are drawn to allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this paper, Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to more particularly point out that which the Applicants regard as the invention, and to include subject matter indicated by the Examiner as being allowable, and Claim 2 has been cancelled. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 3, the claims remaining in this Application, as amended, are now allowable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the cited reference. Therefore, dependent Claim 3, as amended should now be allowed.

Applicants are not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.99.

This Application is now believed to be in condition for favorable reconsideration and early allowance, and such actions are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Lawrence P. Kessler
Registration No. 24,637
Telephone No. (585) 253-0123
Facsimile No. (585) 726-0894

LPK:dn
Attachment(s)
NexPress Solutions LLC
1447 St. Paul Street
Rochester, NY 14653-7103